

<b>RTIP ID#</b> <i>(required)</i> RIV010206				
<b>TCWG Consideration Date</b> November 24, 2009				
<b>Project Description</b> <i>(clearly describe project)</i> The City of Lake Elsinore (City), in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) District 8, is proposing to make improvements and ramp modifications to the Interstate 15 (I-15)/Railroad Canyon Road interchange and to construct a new interchange 0.18 mile north of the existing I-15/Franklin Street overcrossing in the City.				
<b>Alternative 1.</b> No Build Alternative.				
<b>Alternative 2.</b> Reconstruct the northbound ramps to a hook ramp configuration to Grape Street; eliminate the existing northbound diagonal entrance ramp at Railroad Canyon Road; and maintain a diamond configuration for the southbound ramps at Railroad Canyon Road with a new interchange at Franklin Street.				
<b>Alternative 3 (locally Preferred Alternative).</b> Reconstruct the northbound ramps to a hook ramp configuration to Grape Street; eliminate the existing northbound diagonal entrance ramp at Railroad Canyon Road; reconstruct the southbound ramps to a hook configuration to Casino Road; and eliminate the existing southbound diagonal exit ramp at Railroad Canyon Road with a new interchange at Franklin Street.				
<b>Type of Project</b> <i>(use Table 1 on instruction sheet)</i> Reconfigure existing interchange and construct a new interchange				
<b>County</b> Riverside	<b>Narrative Location/Route &amp; Postmiles I-15 PM 16.3/21.0</b> <b>Caltrans Projects – EA#</b> 0A4400			
<b>Lead Agency:</b> Lake Elsinore				
<b>Contact Person</b> Ken Seumalo	<b>Phone#</b> (951) 674-3124	<b>Fax#</b> (951) 674-8761	<b>Email</b> <a href="mailto:kseumalo@lake-elsinore.org">kseumalo@lake-elsinore.org</a>	
<b>Hot Spot Pollutant of Concern</b> <i>(check one or both)</i> <b>PM2.5</b> x <b>PM10</b> x				
<b>Federal Action for which Project-Level PM Conformity is Needed</b> <i>(check appropriate box)</i>				
<b>Categorical Exclusion (NEPA)</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>EA or Draft EIS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>FONSI or Final EIS</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>PS&amp;E or Construction</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b>
<b>Scheduled Date of Federal Action:</b> October 2011				
<b>NEPA Delegation – Project Type</b> <i>(check appropriate box)</i>				
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exempt</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Section 6004 – Categorical Exemption</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Section 6005 – Non-Categorical Exemption</b>		
<b>Current Programming Dates</b> <i>(as appropriate)</i>				
	<b>PE/Environmental</b>	<b>ENG</b>	<b>ROW</b>	<b>CON</b>
<b>Start</b>	May 2009	May 2009	July 2012	Jan 2016
<b>End</b>	Oct 2011	Jun 2012	March 2013	Nov 2017

<p><b>Project Purpose and Need (Summary):</b> <i>(attach additional sheets as necessary)</i></p> <p>Increased queuing on Railroad Canyon Road is primarily caused by the close proximity of signalized intersections at the ramps, Casino Road and Grape Street. This situation creates recurrent congestion and an overall reduction in traffic circulation and safety. The City of Lake Elsinore initiated this project to relieve existing congestion and improve the overall operation of the interchange. Currently, peak hour congestion on the exit ramps and surrounding streets impacts the overall operation of the interchange.</p>
<p><b>Surrounding Land Use/Traffic Generators</b> <i>(especially effect on diesel traffic)</i></p> <p>The land uses in the vicinity of the interchange include residential and light commercial/retail developments.</p>
<p><b>Opening Year: Build and No Build LOS, AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT of proposed facility</b></p> <p><b>Railroad Canyon Road</b></p> <p>2014 No Build, N/A</p> <p>2014 Alt 2, ADT = 28,600, Truck ADT = 2,290 (8%), LOS: B-E</p> <p>2014 Alt 3, ADT = 29,000, Truck ADT = 2,320 (8%), LOS: A-D</p>
<p><b>RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: Build and No Build LOS, AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT of proposed facility</b></p> <p><b>Railroad Canyon Road</b></p> <p>2040 No Build, ADT = 51,500, Truck ADT = 4,120 (8%), LOS: F</p> <p>2040 Alt 2, ADT = 44,200, Truck ADT = 3,540 (8%), LOS: D-F</p> <p>2040 Alt 3, ADT = 44,200, Truck ADT = 3,540 (8%), LOS: D-F</p>
<p><b>Opening Year: If facility is an interchange(s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT</b></p> <p><b>Franklin Street</b></p> <p>2014 No Build, N/A</p> <p>2014 Alt 2, ADT = 9,700, Truck ADT = 776 (8%), LOS: A-C</p> <p>2014 Alt 3, ADT = 9,700, Truck ADT = 776 (8%), LOS: A-C</p> <p><b>RTP Horizon Year / Design Year: If facility is an interchange (s) or intersection(s), Build and No Build cross-street AADT, % and # trucks, truck AADT</b></p> <p><b>Franklin Street</b></p> <p>2040 No Build, ADT = 25,000, Truck ADT = 2,000 (8%), LOS: F</p> <p>2040 Alt 2, ADT = 15,000, Truck ADT = 1,200 (8%), LOS: A-C</p> <p>2040 Alt 3, ADT = 15,000, Truck ADT = 1,200 (8%), LOS: A-C</p>
<p><b>Describe potential traffic redistribution effects of congestion relief</b> <i>(impact on other facilities)</i></p> <p>See attached analysis</p>
<p><b>Comments/Explanation/Details</b> <i>(attach additional sheets as necessary)</i></p> <p>See attached analysis</p>

### PM<sub>2.5</sub>/PM<sub>10</sub> Hot-Spot Analysis

The proposed project is within a nonattainment area for federal PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> standards. Therefore, per 40 CFR, Part 93, analyses are required for conformity purposes. However, the EPA does not require hot-spot analyses, qualitative or quantitative, for projects that are not listed in Section 93.123(b)(1) as an air quality concern. The project does not qualify as a POAQC because of the following reasons:

- i) The proposed project is not a new or expanded highway project. The proposed project is an interchange reconstruction project (Railroad Canyon Road) and a new interchange construction project (Franklin Street) that does not increase the capacity of I-15. This type of project improves freeway interchange operations by reducing traffic congestion and improving merge operations. Based on the *Traffic Operations Analysis* (August 2009), the proposed Build Alternatives would increase the capacity of Railroad Canyon Road and Franklin Street. However, the traffic volumes would not exceed the 125,000 average daily trips threshold for a POAQC. In addition, the total truck percentages along Railroad Canyon Road and Franklin Street would not exceed the 8 percent threshold, and the total truck average annual daily traffic (AADT) would not exceed the 10,000-vehicle threshold for POAQC. The future traffic volumes along Railroad Canyon Road, Franklin Street, and other local roadways are shown in Table 1.
- ii) The proposed project does not affect intersections that are at LOS D, E, or F with a significant number of diesel vehicles. Based on the *Traffic Operations Analysis* (August 2009), the proposed Build Alternatives would reduce the delay and improve the LOS at intersections within the project vicinity. The LOS conditions in the project vicinity with and without the proposed Build Alternatives are shown in Tables 2 through 4.
- iii) The proposed project does not include the construction of a new bus or rail terminal.
- iv) The proposed project does not expand an existing bus or rail terminal.
- v) The proposed project is not in or affecting locations, areas, or categories of sites that are identified in the PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> applicable implementation plan or implementation plan submission, as appropriate, as sites of violation or possible violation.

Therefore, the proposed Build Alternatives meet the CAA requirements and 40 CFR 93.116 without any explicit hot-spot analysis. The proposed Build Alternatives would not create a new, or worsen an existing, PM<sub>10</sub> or PM<sub>2.5</sub> violation.

**Table 1 2040 Average Daily Traffic Volumes (Total AADT/Truck AADT)**

Roadway Link	Alt 1 Traffic Volumes	Alt 2 Traffic Volumes	Alt 3 Traffic Volumes
Railroad Canyon Road	51,500/4,120	44,200/3,540	44,200/3,540
Franklin Street	25,000/2,000	15,000/1,200	15,000/1,200
Grape Street	13,400/1,070	22,900/1,830	22,900/1,830
Casino Drive	5,200/415	4,300/345	15,320/1,225
Auto Center Drive	18,400/1,470	8,770/700	8,930/715

Source: *Traffic Operations Analysis*, August 2009.

**Table 2 2040 without Project (Alternative 1) Intersection LOS**

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)
Franklin St./Auto Center Dr.	A	9.6	F	144.5
Franklin St./Canyon Estates Dr.	F	-	F	-
Railroad Canyon Rd./Mission Trail	F	224.4	F	426.0
Railroad Canyon Rd./Casino Rd.	F	304.6	F	523.6
Railroad Canyon Rd./I-15 SB Ramps	F	343.3	F	517.0
Railroad Canyon Rd./I-15 NB Ramps	F	330.2	F	547.1
Railroad Canyon Rd./Grape St	F	315.3	F	331.8

Source: *Traffic Operations Analysis*, August 2009.

**Table 3 2040 Alternative 2 Intersection LOS**

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)
Franklin St./Auto Center Dr.	C	28.3	C	28.3
Franklin St./I-15 SB Ramps	B	10.1	A	9.5
Franklin St./I-15 NB Ramps	B	15.9	B	21.1
Franklin St./Canyon Estates Dr.	A	9.2	A	6.9
Railroad Canyon Rd./Mission Trail	F	150.9	F	355.4
Railroad Canyon Rd./Casino Rd.	E	58.3	F	327.2
Railroad Canyon Rd./I-15 SB Ramps	C	21.1	D	37.2
Grape St./I-15 NB Ramps	A	9.3	B	17.1
Railroad Canyon Rd./Grape St	D	40.9	D	43.7

Source: *Traffic Operations Analysis*, August 2009.

**Table 4 2040 Alternative 3 Intersection LOS**

Intersection	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay (sec)	LOS	Delay (sec)
Franklin St./Auto Center Dr.	C	28.3	C	28.3
Franklin St./I-15 SB Ramps	B	10.1	A	9.5
Franklin St./I-15 NB Ramps	B	15.9	C	21.1
Franklin St./Canyon Estates Dr.	A	9.2	A	6.9
Railroad Canyon Rd./Mission Trail	C	29.2	F	166.4
Railroad Canyon Rd./Casino Rd.	C	21.2	F	219.2
Grape St./I-15 NB Ramps	B	12.9	B	15.8
Railroad Canyon Rd./Grape St	C	29.6	D	42.8
Casino Rd./I-15 SB Ramps	B	11.1	A	7.0

Source: *Traffic Operations Analysis*, August 2009.